DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 780 SO 018 521

AUTHOR Smith, Robert Charles; Lischin, Stevi
TITLE Pathways of the American Peace Movement and the Increasing Role of Intercultural Relations.
PUB DATE 28 Mar 86
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the International Studies Association (27th, Anaheim, CA, March 28, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Conflict Resolution; *Disarmament; *International Relations; International Studies; Multicultural Education; *Peace; *World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS Conscientious Objectors; Pacifism

ABSTRACT

Four major pathways the U.S. peace movement has followed may be identified as: (1) pacifism; (2) conscientious objection; (3) antimilitarism; and (4) internationalism. Those individuals following pacifism have held a personal dedication to participate in no war or violent revolution. Conscientious objectors have held a selective objection against participation in one particular war but not necessarily in another. Those individuals following antimilitarism oppose military influence over civil affairs. Internationalists have held the commitment to build among nations the institutional mechanisms necessary to preserve order and provide non-violent means for resolving disputes. The peace movement of the 1980s is typified by the four part program of a new postwar coalition opposed to the arms race, called the Mobilization for Survival. The coalition pressed to eliminate nuclear weapons and nuclear power, to stop the arms race, and to fund human needs. Those in the peace movement can open new pathways by breaking resistance to the peace movement such as increasing their understanding of media and avoiding the images that detract from their essential purpose. An important step will be taken when intercultural relations become an integral part of the peace movement. The basic rationale for including intercultural relations in the peace movement is that the more the people of the world know of one another, the less discord and distrust there will be among them. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288780

PATHWAYS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE MOVEMENT AND THE INCREASING ROLE OF INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS

by

ROBERT CHARLES SMITH, PH. D.

and

STEVI LISCHIN, PH. D.

THE PROJECT FOR INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
80 Bayside Drive
Atlantic Highlands, NJ 07716

Presented to the 27th Annual Conference

of the

International Studies Association

Anaheim, California

March 28, 1986

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dr. Robert C. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO018521

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PATHWAYS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE MOVEMENT AND THE INCREASING ROLE OF INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS

The development of peaceseeking in America is a story full of promise, frustration and paradox. America helps "lead the world in how much domestic violence it has, how many thermonuclear warheads it produces, and how many weapons it sells at home and abroad". But America also has a strikingly tenacious peace movement of well educated and organized volunteer activists, and a position of world leadership in plotting out routes toward preferable world orders.[1]

As a developmentalist, I am particularly concerned with describing and understanding how development occurs and how fuller potentials may be reached. These concerns apply to the development of individuals and cultures as well as to the process of peaceseeking. So, although my main task here is to describe the past, present, and future possibilities of the American Peace Movement, I have sought to keep in mind certain basic questions: What metaphors are useful in understanding the nature of this movement? What pathways has it followed into the present? Where is it now? What barriers could be removed to allow for new possibilities and pathways to emerge?

The difficulties I face as I dig through the rather scant literature on the American Peace Movement reveal something about the nature of this movement. I am dismayed by the absence of a category termed "peace". I do finally come upon a few esoteric-looking references categorized under "peace of mind", but the relation between these references and the present topic is, at the very least, not too clear. A fellow researcher goes through the pictorial divisions of both the Library of Congress and the National Archives finding no appropriate categories related to peace. Finally he discovers a box of pictures labeled "peace parades" only to find photographs of Armistice Day - Victory Parades. At last, he finds the photographs of the leading American peaceseekers he was looking for - but under designations such as "Antiwar Agitators".[2]

The picture that begins to emerge is that the American Peace Movement has been highly fragmented, difficult to categorize, filled with conflicting assumptions and values, and has actually had very little to do with "peace of mind".

From the time of the Puritan migrations, American intellectuals have thought of themselves as a people uniquely dedicated to the cause of world peace. And yet, there has been no other reform that Americans have talked of more and done less about than that of world peace.

Certainly, the peace movement has been among the most multi-dimensional of American reform movements. It has attracted the committment of innumerable individuals and organizations, yet the forms of their committment have been diverse and changing. American peaceseekers have always been rather a mixed lot.

In general, peaceseekers have as a matter of principle, denounced war as a form of collective behavior that corrupts social order, religious ethics, and human well being. Based on these beliefs, peaceseekers have worked to establish alternative means of resolving human conflicts;they have sought to develop "forms of group harmony so that peace might persist as a social living dynamic."[3]

The pathways I sought to discover begin to emerge. Based on DeBenedetti's work,[4] four major pathways that the American Peace Movement have followed may be identified: the pathways of pacifism, conscientious objection,antimilitarism, and internationalism.

Those following the pathway of pacifism have held a personal dedication to participate in no war or violent revolution, and to seek nonviolent means of resolving conflict. This line of development has evolved from 17th Century nonresistant practitioners of defensiveness to modern active or revolutionary nonviolence.

In the mid 19th Century a sharp controversy over the Question of Violent Means ripped apart those following the pacifist pathway. Can a pacifist defend using violence to reform society? Or, is the use of violence absolutely contradictory to essential pacifist principles? Major quarrels erupted on this issue and even Quakerism, the mainstay of American religious pacifism,became internally split; not until the outbreak of World War I did modern pacifism emerge in America. The more progressive and liberal elements of this pathway left an indelible imprint through the establishment of enduring citizen peace organizations of the 20th Century America such as American Friends Service Committee and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

During the 1920s and 30s the old question of violent means reemerged:how could pacifists bring about reforms without sanctioning violence? A more assertive pacifism emerged which was committed to active individual non-cooperation in war preparations and collective nonviolent activism. After 1935, this movement supported industrial sit-down strikes and black American demands for civil rights. This activist development became the basis for the next generation's civil rights movement, anti-Vietnam War activism, mass protests against nuclear-plant construction and atomic war preparations. Active non-violence had become established as a major feature of modern American life and politics.

Whereas pacifism is opposed in principle to all wars, conscientious objection is not the same and it constitutes the second major pathway of the American Peace Movement. Those following the pathway of conscientious objection have held a selective objection, in conscience, against participation in one particular war, but not necessarily in another. Since conscientious objection has appeared within a pacifist context, the distinction has often been unclear. But during the 20th Century, conscientious objection has not only earned the committment of people from the Protestant tradition, but has also won over Roman Catholics, Jews, and even non-religious people of conscience.

Antimilitarism,a third major pathway in American Peace history has flared up more powerfully at some times in history than others. Those following the pathway of antimilitarism oppose military influence over civil affairs.

This tradition began in America with the colonial opposition to a standing army. The early days of the Republic witnessed an essential controversy: Was it necessary and important to maintain a standing army for common defense? Or was such an army a fundamental danger to liberty? The fear of centralized armed power consistently impeded nationalist plans for a national military system, this fear aggravated a long standing hostility toward permanent and professional armies.

Resentments toward compulsory militia duty and toward privileged institutions such as the US Military Academy at West Point were expressed during the 19th Century. But antimilitarism nevertheless subsided: there was no real standing army in America and there even seemed a popular fascination with military titles and dress-DeToqueville perceived a secret connection between the military character and the character of the American People.[5]

In the 20th Century, Dwight Eisenhower's warnings about the Military-Industrial Complex have gone virtually unheeded. The business of marketing major weapon systems, both within and outside perceived national interests, is a dangerous issue we face today.

Internationalism, is the fourth pathway which has evolved through American peace history, but the nature of this pathway has changed significantly throughout its course. Those following the pathway of internationalism have held the committment to build among nations the institutional mechanisms necessary to preserve order and provide non-violent means for resolving disputes. This pathway has always been conceived as a way of turning international rivalries into harmonious competitions.[6]

From the days of the American Revolution, internationalists have sought to establish a "law of nations" or international legal system to facilitate transnational cooperation and to make war less inhumane. These ideas have been developed through structures like the International Red Cross and the Universal Postal Union.

This pathway has changed significantly through the course of U.S. history and the word "internationalism" has held different useages and connotations for competing factions of antiwar movement and political leaders. These factions have been united by little except for believing that progress toward peace is a real possibility, and that traditional balance of power diplomacy cannot prevent wars. According to Sondra Herman of the University of California,[7] internationalists divided into two groups during World War I, the political internationalists and the community internationalists. These two groups, whether seeking order through arms, or through the simple doing of justice, have defined the pathway of modern internationalist thinking.

Members of these two modes of thought held different world views. The political internationalists advocated the development of legal machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes. The community internationalists, on the other hand, asserted that such formal institutional arrangements in themselves could never prevent wars. The community internationalists stressed the need for the "development of a more organic world consciousness, a sense of international community among peoples of different nations".[8]

These two forms of internationalism reflected more general social philosophies. Elihu Root, Woodrow Wilson and other supporters of the legal-political methods believed in American democratic capitalism and conservative Darwinism. Jane Adams, Thornstein Veblen, and other communalists expressed much doubt about the competitive ethic.

The social positioning of the two groups also differed considerably. The political internationalists who typically headed large organizations or associated themselves with the government, thought in terms of making policy affecting other people. The community internationalists, on the other hand, identified themselves with the international community of scholarship or with the disinherited peoples of the world.

Internationalists enjoyed a shortlived focus of support in the early days of the United Nations, which was an institutionalization of Franklin D. Roosevelt's version of the internationalists' dreams of Woodrow Wilson. This world federalist movement as a U.S. foreign policy, however, was undercut by the U.S. Government policy under Truman to globally contain Communism. The differing world views of those on the internationalist pathway, however, still impacts on us today. Although these four pathways bring us into the present, their individual definitions become less clear.

How may the present period be described?

The Present

In the present period, which begins around 1960, these pathways have gained some resemblence to Los Angeles - vast and convoluted networks of thruways and cloverleafs clogged with vehicles which sometimes parallel, converge, and get tied into knots. Only from above in the traffic helicopter does the chaos come to resemble order and flow.

The Peace Movement entered the 1960s[9] with spokespeople like A.J. Muste espousing antiwar activists to take a "third camp" position aligned neither with Washington nor Moscow.

We saw the rise of such organizations as SANE, Women's Strike for Peace, and the Student Peace Union. High powered intellectuals including David Reisman, Erich Fromm, and Lewis Mumford formed the Committee of Correspondance to focus their efforts on developing alternatives to the arms race. More congressional candidates ran for office on positive peace platforms in 1962 than ever before in Cold War America, and a limited test ban between Washington and Moscow was soon endorsed.

The sudden expansion of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam spurred peaceseekers to defer their first concern with the nuclear arms race and global underdevelopment to the immediate antiwar interests. After the Cuban missle scare, the New Left gained strength and SDS carried the torch by attacking U.S. interventionism in the Third World. But radical and liberal

peaceseekers alike failed to find common ground until they encountered a common issue: Vietnam.

In March, 1964, Senator Fulbright, who chaired the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, attacked the "old myths" of Cold War orthodoxy that were blinding Washington to the new international realities. A series of organized protests and vigils followed which focused on anti-U.S. interventionism in Vietnam.

By the Winter of 1964 there were three constituent parts within the antiwar movement which saw the Vietnam situation quite differently: the anti-imperialists of the sectarian left, the radical pacifist proponants of revolutionary non-violence, and the string of peace liberals that stretched from senatorial critics to Quaker activists. In 1965 after Lyndon Johnson's bombing of North Vietnam, the paths of these three parts experienced their first sense of unity.[10] This was followed by an escalation in the size and scope of protests.

The years 1965 to 1970 witnessed a tremendous expansion of antiwar activism. This rapid escalation of diverse antiwar activities occured with such rapidity and spontaneity that the idea of organizing one coherent movement seemed to defy the rapid pace of the activities. The movement gained even more fuel as peaceseekers saw Washington's failure in Indochina and its failure to overcome poverty and racial injustice at home as part of a major systemic miscalculation. This realization led to a turning point in the peace movement as activists realized that the antiwar momentum should also be channeled into righting domestic injustice and into the prevention of future Vietnams. When the first major ghetto uprising of the decade erupted in the black community of Watts, Los Angeles in early 1965, three hundred representatives from over twenty peace and civil rights organizations met in Washington in the Assembly of Unrepresented People.

It was at this point that the forces of several pathways converged and Jewish and Catholic clergy first became fully involved in anti-Vietnam war activism.

As Senator Fulbright convened the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in February 1966 to hold open hearings on administration policy and its alternatives, an increasing attachment of those described as "hippies" aligned themselves with the peace movement. The hippies added color, comedy, and a gentle spirit to the movement. Young people who had been put off by the unsmiling militant student radicals were attached to the movement as never before.

As war casualties continued to increase and the Johnson administration tried to brand the antiwar movement as communist controlled, factions heretofore supportive of the administration soon joined the movement. Mainstream magazines like Life and Saturday Evening Post as well as financial outlets like The Wall Street Journal and Forbes Magazine began to question the wisdom of the war.

Conscientious objection to military service swelled levels of draft evasion to record heights. Personal decisions not to participate in the war by the famous, such as Mohammed Ali, as well as ordinary citizens, rose to historic proportions.

1966-1970 has been described as the "Center of the Storm". U.N. Secretary U. Thant proposed a Three Point Peace Program. One hundred fifty racial riots seared the country during the first half of 1967. The streets of Oakland filled with antiwar activists in "Stop the Draft Week". The March on the Pentagon was massive.

Washington launched its first overt attack on prominant antiwar activists. SANE co-chairman Spock and four other antiwar leaders were indicted by a federal grand jury. The movement's tension and confusion were compounded by Senator Eugene McCarthy's decision to challenge Lyndon Johnson for the Democratic 1968 presidential nomination with the promise of negotiating a settlement in Vietnam. This campaign had crucial impact on the Johnson authorization to drastically reduce the three year old bombing and to make possible the May Paris Peace Talks among the four warring parties. Concurrently, over 200 major demonstrations rocked American campuses during the first half of 1968.

Brother priests Daniel and Philip Berrigan and seven associates gave new momentum to Catholic radicalism and the antiwar resistance by seizing the records of a local draft board and burning them with a napalm concoction.

Bloodshed was seen domestically as racial tension reached new heights and by the tragic assassinations of Martin Luther King and Robert F. Kennedy. Chaos increased as conflicting opinions at the Chicago Democratic Convention led to three days of police assaults and riots resulting in great inner Party splits paving the way for a Nixon Presidential victory. By summer 1969, the growing realization that Nixon's plans seemed to entail endless war in Vietnam revitalized antiwar activism.

Working in uneasy collaboration, two major groups - the Vietnam Moratorium

Committee and the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam "superintended the largest mass volunteer actions in American history".[11] Perhaps the most moving was the emotionally powerful 38 hour "March against Death" in Washington in November 1969. Marching with individual candles, participants carried placards with names of every American killed in Vietnam in apparently endless procession through a night of rain and high winds.

The army prosecution of Lt. Calley for murdering Mylai villagers brought additional pressure on the Nixon administration. The pressure led Nixon to the policy of "Vietnamizing" the war by a "timetable of withdrawal and eventual settlement". The antiwar movement was, however, identified as the main impediment to concluding the war and V. President Agnew disparaged antiwar militants as a hypocritical corps of violence prone malcontents.[12]

Heated disagreement among different factions of the movement about how to procede erupted. But Nixon's April 1970 authorization of the bombing in Cambodia, and the killing of students at Kent State precipitated the greatest single campus uprising in American history.

In late 1970, moved by the Cambodian invasion and the domestic uproar which followed, peace liberals helped the Congress to pass the Cooper-Church amendment prohibiting the funding of further American ground action in Cambodia and Laos. The Senate also began for the first time to consider legislation designed to set a date for total U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam. More than 40 national peace lobbies organized to press increasingly peaceminded politicians.

With the dawning of the 1970s, there also came a new introspectiveness among peaceseekers. The launching of the Vietnam Veterans against the War group in 1970 reflected their new thinking. "Never before had American soldiers returned from a war to work against it. But never before had they returned so ridden with drugs, so contemptuous of their superiors, and so convinced of the purposelessness in their sacrifice."[13]

In March 1971, Daniel Ellsberg released the Pentagon Papers which revealed the Vietnam War as the well-calculated outcome of aggressive U.S. Policy in Southeast Asia - the American people had been consistently misled by their leaders into believing otherwise.

As the war dragged on, the Indochina Peace Campaign was formed in January 1973 by anti-imperialists and student radicals like Tom Hayden. Actress Jane

Fonda spoke out through this group to inform general audiences about the complexities of politics in Indochina and prerequisites of peace. Most people within the antiwar movement rallied their strength to support the antiwar activist and presidential candidate Senator McGovern. McGovern's campaign sputtered to defeat. Nixon's Inauguration spurred a counter-inauguration rally of 100,000 people in Washington on January 20, 1973. But this was the last march. The long sought peace agreement was signed seven days later.

The anti-Vietnam War movement was unique in the history of American antiwar activism in the way that it persisted beyond the war's apparent end. Peaceseekers pressed Washington to respect the Paris accords, worked to end U.S. bombing of antigovernment guerrillas in Cambodia and Laos and sought to cut off all U.S. support for the Lon Nol and Thieu regimes. Domestically, they struggled for reconciliation and sought full amnesty for anyone who had ran afoul of draft or military law.

The U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam has been cited as the greatest victory ever won by the American Peace Movement. A more important aspect of that victory did not come to light until years later when Nixon's and Haldeman's memoirs revealed that a contemplated nuclear strike against North Vietnam in 1969 had been thwarted because of fears that the reaction of antiwar forces would prove uncontrollable.

The peace movement in the 1980s is typified by the four part program of a new post war coalition opposed to the arms race, called the Mobilization for Survival. The coalition pressed to eliminate nuclear weapons and nuclear power, to stop the arms race, and to fund human needs. This work reached its peak in June 1982 helping to coordinate the largest demonstration in U.S. history - a million demonstrators gathered in New York's Central Park to protest against the arms race. Organized opposition to the nuclear arms race reached an all time high in this country and abroad between 1980 and 1982. This opposition revived civil disobedience, helped issue the Peace pastoral letter by 350 American Catholic Bishops, and helped the nuclear freeze movement to emerge. The "Nuclear Winter" concept further supported this movement.

By the end of the current month, March 1986, the peace movement is active and forever evolving. The Great Peace March across the U.S. stalled after a hundred miles, but another mega-event, Hands Across America, looks promising, and the twelve year old Soviet counterpart of Samantha Smith sponsored by the "Children as Peace Makers" organization has won affection in the U.S. The rising consciousness of children to the threat of nuclear holocaust transcends their parents' politics and provides a sober reminder of the crucial tasks

facing future peace movement participants.

Opening the Future

Where is the American Peace Movement going? What barrier gates are obstructing future pathways?

The vigor and vitality of the American Peace Movement in the future is not at all clear. But if the observation is true that peace movements thrive when there is both optimism and pessimism, we may expect growth. There is some optimism today that a nuclear holocaust can be averted and steps toward a more peaceful world can be taken, public opinion polls show massive support for antiwar initiatives such as the nuclear freeze. But there is also certainly a darkly pessimistic side illustrated by the fact that "we are witnessing the largest arms buildup in our nation's history, at a cost of more than two trillion dollars over a five year period".[14]

To help understand where the American Peace Movement is going, it is helpful to look at the nature of movements. A movement may be thought of as a river whose full force is reduced by barriers or flood gates. When these flood gates are opened, the movement is able to push ahead. As a developmentalist, I think about how the future will unfold by identifying past barriers to the movement to see how they might be removed; when gates are opened, new possibilities and future paths may begin to be seen.

Nine particular gates may be identified which, in the past, have closed off new currents and pathways. Most of these closed gates may be considered as self imposed,[15] but ways may be found to open them.

The first of these gates will open when peaceseekers demonstrate that the American Peace Movement reflects basic American values. Despite how we would like to seen ourselves, peaceseeking is often foreign to some American values.

A second gate will open when peaceseekers increase their understanding of media and avoid the images that detract from their essential purpose. The images peace movements have projected are often threatening and unrelated to the peace movement anyhow. There are lessons to be learned from by comparing the public image projected by the combed hair and shirts and ties of the American civil rights movement with the irreverant longhaired kids in revolt against those over thirty-five and their institutions. Particularly among rural and working class Americans, the antiwar movement was even less popular that the Vietnam war itself.

A third gate will open when peaceseekers resolve the class and ideological divisiveness and factionalism which have plagued the movement for so long. American peace advocates have tended to be white, middle class college students, women and "modernist" Protestant clergy from the northeast or from large cities in the west and midwest. There are many peace groups - more functional coalitions may help prevent their power from being dissipated.

A fourth gate will open when peaceseekers give greater focus to immediate and intermediate goals rather than overly focusing on the past, the general present or the distant future. Strong public pressure on specific and immediate situations have had great impact, although often not sustained by linkages with the next steps of the process.

A fifth gate will open when peace movement leaders are able to convince people that wars hurt economies. The Military-Industrial Complex, from Eisenhower's time to the present, has given credence to the idea that war is good for business. Yet the Vietnam war severely damaged the American economy.

A sixth gate will open when peaceseekers are able to change their widespread perception as appeasors on national adversaries. Authoritarian regimes have often captured the highly visible sympathies of antiwar activists.

A seventh gate will open when peaceseekers find the right balance between overdwelling on fear and evil versus hope and positives. Peace can be forgotten when fear, depression, anger and denial are dominant factors. Fear begets fear. The appropriate blend of optimism and pessimism seems necessary for peace movements to thrive. But overdwelling on evil and fear of war can generate support for isolation and even military involvement, as easily as it can support peace goals. Have recent media emphases on the consequences of nuclear war had the effect of giving unexpected popular support to the great myth of the "defensive missle shield".

An eighth gate will open when peaceseekers find the most effective balance between appeals to both the heads and hearts of people. The peace movement has often been accused of being oversentimental and weak in realist analysis. Yet peaceseekers must ultimately appeal to both.

A final gate will open when the importance of intercultural relations becomes an integral part of the peaceseeking movement. This gate deserves particular attention and elaboration and has in fact had far too little visibility within the American Peace Movement. Peace through intercultural relations is composed of several different emphases such as international and global peace education, international educational and cultural exchange, cross-cultural studies, and

conflict resolution.

The basic rationale for this movement is that"the more the peoples of the world know of one another, the less discord and distrust there will be among them."[16] Just as westerners often have difficulty in reconciling individual goals with those of the larger family and community, it can seem very difficult to reconcile national and international needs and interests.Mistakes can generate wars,when nations do not understand one another's psychology or the nature of conflicts.

Because people need to know as much as possible about the similarities and dissimilarities of values and attitudes among people of different cultures,the educational processes involved in teaching and learning become critical factors. Work with teachers and students is highly important because of the multiplier effect in the world of academia-benefits are expanded a thousand times.

Cultural academic exchanges also have "non-academic"benifits. A profound exchange of ideas and values often occur from the prolonged personal contact between colleagues working on special projects. Local citizens are able to receive direct impact through their contact with foreign guests.

But this kind of depth learning doesn't usually just happen by chance. Shockingly, many of today's Study Abroad Programs are greatly lacking in creating the learning processes that result in a depth learning from cross-cultural experiences. Although, there are of course, similarities, it is undeniable that people from different cultures may experience the same event differently-and this fact points to a large arena where major learning can and must take place. With an incredible lack of awareness and experimentation about depth learning in academia, the major strides involved in cross cultural learning have taken place in the corporate classroom where the direct benefits of such learning have been more clear. There has been some wisdom shown in the passage of federal support such as the 1980 International Understanding Program (now contained in Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) and the present administration's renewal of educational and cultural exchanges with the USSR. But even the Fulbright Program has not escaped threats to its survival. Perhaps 1986, the International Year of Peace, will experience real strides in the development of Peace Studies which will have profound and long term effects on the values, attitudes, and lack of knowledge regarding relationships between people of different cultures.

Peter Hagelstein may not be a well know name to most people, but in 1979 when he was 24 years old he came up with an inspired idea that may ultimately terminate the peace movement or perhaps even life on earth. Peter's idea for a laser device became a key component in the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative program and has been called the most innovative weaponry since the hydrogen bomb.

Hagelstein, however, never wanted to work on weapons - he wanted to win the Nobel Prize by creating the world's first laboratory x-ray laser - a device with wide applications in biology and medicine but with no useage in war. His life has been deeply troubled by the splits he feels about the uses of his invention. In fact, as he contemplates war "he stresses not technical solutions to the arms race, but political ones such as cultural exchange between the superpowers". What will make war less likely? Certainly not defense systems, he says, "but I think something that would make a big difference is if there were large scale cultural exchanges between the Soviets and us - so we could at least get to know one another."[17]

If the aim of the peace movement is to reduce misunderstandings between peoples of the world, that aim will certainly not become outmoded. The incredible technological revolution we are currently experiencing has literally given us more channels for communication with people around the world that could have been conceived only a few years ago. But technology alone cannot adress the great need to share and understand values. Mutual human understanding remains the main hope to insure the survival and progress of peace on Earth.

REFERENCES

[1]Charles DeBenedetti, The Peace Movement in American History, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980, p. 197,200.

[2]Charles Chatfield, Peace Movements in America, New York: Schocken Books, 1973, p. ix.

[3]DeBenedetti, 1980, p. xii.

[4]Charles DeBenedetti, "Peace History in the American Manner", The History Teacher, Vol. 18 #1 (November, 1984), p. 75-110.

[5]Ibid, 1984, p. 85.

[6]Ibid, 1984, p. 86.

[7]in Chatfield, 1973, p. 171-4.

[8]Ibid, p. 172.

[9]This section draws particularly from DeBenedetti, 1980, Ch. 8.

[10]Chatfield, 1973, p. 171-3.

[11]Ibid, p. 184.

[12]Ibid, p. 185.

[13]Ibid, p. 189.

[14]Sidney Lens, "The Twisting Path to Peace", The Progressive, July, 1984, p. 6.

[15]Ibid.

[16]William Ammerman, "The Fulbright Program: A Quiet and Efficient Success", Phi Delta Kappan, February, 1984, p. 421.

[17]William Broad,"The Secret Behind Star Wars", The New York Times Magazine, August 11, 1985, p 32-51.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Robert C. Smith and Stevi Lischin are specialists in intercultural relations. They are the co-founders of The Project for Intercultural Development and have worked as a team in consulting and teaching for over a decade.

Their work is focused on assisting people from different cultural backgrounds in working together. Since 1970 they have worked extensively with thousands of people from diverse backgrounds, both in the U. S. and overseas. They have long term involvements in Asia and have been visiting professors at Kyung Hee University in Seoul.

As university graduate school professors and administrators for over a decade, they collaborated in developing a widely recognized graduate program in human relations.

They consult with corporations, health care organizations, universities, and peace organizations. They have published internationally and presented papers about intercultural relations to international organizations. In Fall, 1987, they lectured on intercultural relations at Cambridge University in England.

Robert Smith received his Ph. D. from The University of Maryland in 1970. He was a full time graduate school professor at Fairleigh Dickinson University from 1970 to 1985 and was Director of The Graduate Center for Human Development.

Stevi Lischin received her Ph. D. from Union Graduate School in 1978. She was a full time graduate school professor at Fairleigh Dickinson University from 1975 to 1985 and was a regional administrator at The Graduate Center for Human Development.